

COBBETT'S WEEKLY POLITICAL REGISTER.

Vol. 81.—No. 5.]

LONDON, SATURDAY, AUGUST 3RD, 1833.

[Price, 1s. 2d.]



POLICE AFFAIR.

THE committee met on Wednesday, to take their REPORT into consideration; but, desirous, in a matter of so much importance, not to decide without due deliberation, having heard each other's opinion on the subject, adjourned until Tuesday next, then to come to a final determination. The report and the evidence will then be laid before the House, and the parishes of the metropolis will then have the facts before them, and the grounds whereon to proceed in suggesting and in applying for a remedy for the evils of which the petitioners complained; and, I must add here, that the conduct of these petitioners has been, from first to last, and their characters appear to be, such, that I have had the greatest satisfaction in having had their petition committed to my hands; and, I am sure that the people of the whole of this metropolis will think them worthy of their praise and gratitude.

NEGRO-TWENTY-MILLIONS.

THIS vote passed the House of Commons last night (Wednesday), by a very great majority; having my vote against it, and my vote having been given against every sum for this purpose, however small. The interest of this

money is equal to *good farm-wages* (30*l.* a year) for 33,000 labourers' families; that is to say, more labourers' families than there are in the two counties of *Bedford* and *Berks*; as will be seen by my *Geographical Dictionary*. I do hope, that the country never will pay this money; nor any part of it. If paid, it must come out of the sweat of those *who work*; and will not be paid by those who have been petitioning on the subject. When "the 187,000 females" were signing their pretty names, they little thought that they were petitioning to have the bread taken out of the mouths of their children! If given, the money ought to have come from a *voluntary contribution*, and not from a tax on the fruit of the toil of the people. I and my colleagues have done every thing in our power to prevent this new load being laid upon a people who are already so oppressed that they are driven to half-madness by their wants; and, at any rate, our constituents will see our names enrolled amongst those who have opposed this grant of the people's money.

Over and above this charge on the people, there are the consequences to the colonies, and the *perpetual charge of maintaining force to make the negroes work!* Work for others they will not without force; so that, after all, they must still be slaves; or the colonies must be ruined. I think, that the latter will be the case. They will not work for hire, while they can exist without it; a very little, in such a climate, suffices for their existence; and where they are such a *prodigious majority*, who is to expect, that they will not take what they want, as long as there is any thing to take? In short, this whole scheme amounts to this: taxing the laborious people of this kingdom for the purpose of making the negro-race more miserable than they have ever yet been, and for destroying the value, to England, of almost the only colonies of which it is her interest to retain the possession.

"THE COLLISION."

THIS over, for the present, at any rate; and the WHIGS seem to be "comfortable again." The *Times* says, that the TORIES asked, "WHAT'S NEXT?" And, that, then, they stopped short! The answer was, I suppose, a "radical Ministry"; and, if by any chance, they cast an eye at ME, I take the opportunity of this present writing to declare, that I, rather than undertake to carry on, or to assist in carrying on, or be thought to wish to see carried on, this system, or any system demanding taxes to a greater amount than sixteen millions a year in gold; rather than any of these, I would be, during the remainder of my life, an actual operative in emptying the receptacles of filth in this WEN; or, still more hateful to my thoughts, I would be a hirer, an employer, a payer of, and an associate and consuler with, a race of most damnable villains called SPIES. So that neither WHIGS nor TORIES need think of me, at any rate, when they are asking "what's next." I think, however, that both of them must now begin to see, that the present system cannot go on much longer. The next session of Parliament must bring some changes of considerable magnitude. We have made none yet; but all feel, that the changes must come. The negro affair is a revolution complete in the West Indies, made to humour mistaken compassion, and to gratify ambitious hypocrisy. The "law reforms" are mere scheming, wild as the winds; the "church reforms," as far as proposed, are revolutionary without benefit or satisfaction to the people; that relief from their burdens, which was, in fact, the only thing for which they wanted reform at all, they have found none of: daily and hourly still more and more of the fruits of their labour are taken from them; and they see not the smallest prospect of any relief in which they are to share.

In such a state of things, it signifies not who are the men who exercise the powers of the state; there can be no willing obedience to the law; it must

be a government of force; and we well know what must be the end of such a government. And, let not those who have the power in their hands imagine, that they have seen, even in this House of Commons, all that they are to see. The members have scarcely had time for a moment's reflection; they have been bewildered and buried in the multiplicity and the magnitude of the matters heaped upon their attention; they have been influenced by fears, coming constantly in conflict with their judgment; they have, according to their general character, which is also in accordance with the character of the people whom they represent, been held, a great many of them, in restraint by the cautiousness arising from their want of experience; and this has, in numerous instances, been the case with myself. But, when we have had six months for a review of what has been done: when we have had time to examine all the acts, reports, estimates, returns, and accounts, that have been laid before us; when we have had time to form our judgment on all these, and become familiar with their contents; when we have had time for this, it will be hard indeed, if there be not a score or two of us, ready to place before the eyes of the House and of the country, a true and full statement of the wrongs done to our constituents, and to point out the remedies which ought to be applied. In the teeth of such a statement, there is no Government that can get along: it may struggle for awhile in opposition; but, it must finally give way, and the system must be changed. The sinews of it are the taxes; and, while small diminutions of these are unfelt in the way of relief to the people, they are felt very sensibly by the Government, whose strength arises from the power of bestowing that of which it is thus compelled to relinquish the exaction; and, thus, the longer the change is postponed, the greater the discontent of the people, and the smaller the power of the Government to make head against that discontent.

But, what do I mean by a change of the system? I am accused of wanting

"destroy the institutions of the country." Never was there anything so flagrantly false. I find fault with nothing which is not a *glaring innovation* on those institutions, which always have been, and always are, a subject of my praise, and, as an Englishman, a subject of my boast. I want to restore those institutions, which have either been suppressed, or left us only in name. And I know that this restoration is practicable without doing injustice to any man: I know, too, that it will take place; and the only question in my mind is, whether it will be accomplished by peaceable, or by violent means: my wishes as well as my endeavours have always been directed to the former species of means; and, if the latter be finally resorted to by the people, while I say, God forbid they should be provoked so to resort, I must declare beforehand, that they will have as good a right as Langton and the Barons had, in the reign of JOHN, to inscribe on their banners, "WE WILL NOT SUFFER THE LAWS OF ENGLAND TO BE CHANGED."

What! Is a national debt, which dooms the child in the cradle to work all its life to pay a debt contracted in the time of its grandfather, an *institution of the country*? Is the seizure of men's goods and the imprisoning and punishing of their bodies *without trial by jury*, an *institution of the country*? Is the transportation of men for seven years for being in pursuit of those wild animal, which the law of nature and the common law declare to be the property of all mankind, an *institution of the country*? Is the employing of SLAVES an *institution of that country*, the common law of which makes *evildoing*, though merely for the purposes of scandal, an indictable crime? These are amongst the things that I find fault with, and that I would abate; and I defy any man to point out one *"institution of the country"* for the destruction of which I have ever expressed a desire; or to effect which destruction I have ever laboured.

However, one single straw I care not for anything that has been, or can be, said about my motives: the working

people of England were, when I was born, well fed, well clad, and had each his barrel of beer in his house; and, let what may be the accompanying consequence, if they be not thus again before I die, every one shall say, that the fault has not been that of

WM. COBBETT.

"THE CRISIS."

To the Editor of the True Sun.

Bolt-court, 26. July, 1833.

SIR,—This, the *Morning Chronicle* of to-day tells us, this "*has at length arrived*," alluding to the defeat which the Ministers, last night, experienced in the House of Lords; and it tells us, in the conclusion of its article, that "the House of Lords have proclaimed their effectual opposition to the foreign policy of the Ministers; to their reforms in the law; and now, to their reforms in the church; and we confess, that the TASK OF GOING ON appears hopeless, while we have scarcely nerves to look forward to what may be the consequences of their being compelled to make a *contrary decision*." Ah, Sir! as long as places yield money and patronage, and as long as forty thousand pounds a year shall be suffered to be expended in *secret services*; as long as they are allowed to do what they have been doing since they have been in power, the *Chronicle* need be under no apprehension of their coming voluntarily to that "*contrary decision*," which seems so much to alarm it; and yet, if they do attempt to "*go on*" now, what but a company of grenadiers, going and pushing them by the shoulders till they get them out of the buildings, can get them out of those buildings; at any rate, what short of the remedy which was said to have been pointed out by old George the Third? When a building is on fire, you see the rats escaping in every direction, long before the fire reaches their recesses; but these Whig-vermin must have changed their nature if they quit them until they are *singed*.

"*The task of going on!*" Going on with *what*? Going on with rescinding votes for the repeal of the malt tax? Going on with red-coat courts-of-justice bills, and that most signal "*reform in the law*?" Going on with house and window taxes, and surcharges and seizures of goods? Going on with making us pay sixty-five thousand a year to men who have been ambassadors and *chargés-d'affaires*? Going on with making us pay BURKE's pension still, and a pension of twenty-two years to a man for having been *five months* a *chargé-d'affaires* at Florence, that man being a parson of the Church of England, and having two livings all the time? Going on with their refusal to make the rich to pay legacy and probate duty, while they actually *impond* money in the savings banks, to make the poor pay that duty? Going on with their system of making the rich pay a duty of 25 per cent. on their wine, and making the poor pay, in tax and monopoly, 200 per cent. on their beer? Going on with the poor-law commissioners, and their SURGES BOURNE's bills, and their projects for preventing the labourers in Sussex from "*living too high*?" Going on with affairs like that of Calthorpe-street, and with the whole of that system which is now about to be developed? Going on with their mad project for taking twenty millions out of the sweat of the people of England, to be given to the slave-owners, and for making the slaves in fact more miserable than ever? But, Sir, not to tire you, going on with a resolution, **THAT ENGLAND SHALL NEVER HAVE ANY THING BUT SEPTENNIAL PARLIAMENTS?**

Dismal, indeed, must be the consequences, if they should not be able to "*go on*" without all these. As to the matter which has produced this second decision against them, I voted for the original bill being *brought in*; but, the moment I saw the bill, that moment I resolved never to vote for it, or for any part of it, seeing in it, not only no good to the people of Ireland, in general, but infinite mischief; leaving the church establishment disgraced and degraded;

marked out for hatred and contempt; still in existence for all the purposes of annoyance to the Catholics, dishonoured in the eyes of the Protestants; and, above all things, I saw a transfer of immense estates from *easy landlords* to *sharp-biting landlords*, thereby making the working tenant worse off than before, and adding to the evils of non-residence, by bringing out of Ireland a larger portion of its produce than was brought out of it before. This was no "*church reform*;" it was, upon a small scale, "*what the REFORMATION*" itself was: a taking away from the church and the poor cultivators, and giving to the lay-aristocracy; and that is not what we Radicals call "*a church reform*."

What are to be those "*consequences*," which the *Chronicle* apprehends from a turning out of its masters, it would be great presumption in me to say. I have been neither "*at Apsley House*," nor at "*his Royal Highness's the Duke of Cumberland's*;" but, as to the cry of the *Times* of this morning, "**THE HOUSE OF COMMONS TO THE RESCUE;**" as to this, the *Times* ought first to ascertain *who is to go to the "rescue" of the House of Commons*; who is to go the "*rescue*" of those who rescinded their vote on the malt tax, and determined that we shall *always have Septennial Parliaments*, or no Parliaments at all? What! will the Whigs attempt to persuade us that the Lords would do *more* than rescind the vote on the malt tax; would do *more* than give us *Septennial Parliaments for ever*? Would they make us believe that the Lords would add to the malt tax; add to the house and window taxes, the surcharges, and the seizures of goods? As to finance, would the Whigs persuade us that the Lords would do *more* than make the King a partner with a band of private persons in making money for his people; that they would do *more* than make us pay two pounds for one pound that was borrowed; that they would do *more* than take the poor man's bed from under him without a minute's warning, as would have been done by the *Local Courts*

Bill; that they would make us pay more than twenty millions to the slave-owners for having "violated the laws of God and man" for so many, many years?

Oh, no, Sir! The Lords would not do more than these, nor nearly so much. The Lords have not been spectators of all that has been going on during the last six months, without seeing fully clearly, that there is something to be done which the Whigs will not do. The Lords have discovered by this time, that a ten-pound constituency is not much in favour of Lords; and the people, on their part, have discovered that of all the hellish things in this world, nothing, as the Americans are now saying from one end of the States to the other, is so perfectly hellish as an "ARISTOCRACY OF MONEY."

The Lords have been perfectly right in the two cases where they have decided against the Ministers. About their motives I say nothing, because I really know nothing; but I am at all times prepared to show that the two decisions were not against the *people*, but for the *people*; by the *people* I mean those industrious classes who produce every thing by their skill and their labour. What reason, then, have we to complain of the House of Lords? And, will the *people* go to the "rescue" upon grounds like these? Had they sent a repeal of the Septennial Bill up to the Lords, then, indeed, the people might have come to their "rescue." When JAMES the Second found himself in great peril, he, (having just heard of the defection of his daughter ANNE), addressing himself to the then Earl of BEDFORD, exclaimed, "Where am I to look, my lord, when my own children desert me?" The Earl answered: "I am too old, may it please your MAJESTY; I once had a son who could have served you, if he had been alive!" The Whigs have not as yet killed the people, to be sure; but the people's answer to them is, in substance, that which the Earl of BEDFORD gave to the unfortunate KING. Oh, no! They would have done anything to the people, and have been doing everything, in the hope

of securing the forbearance of the Lords, and the Lords have not been base enough to be secured by such means.

I am, Sir,

Your most obedient,

and most humble servant,

WM. COBBETT.

LOCAL COURTS, &c.

TO WM. COBBETT, M.P.

SIR,—The Lords, whatever may have been their motives, or the arguments by which they were led to their decision, I am disposed to think, took a wise and very wholesome step, in rejecting Lord Brougham and Vaux's "Local Courts" bill. I perceive that you have used the most forcible terms of even your powerful language in treating the bill with unmeasured scorn and contempt. I must admit that I have not read it, and that I have come to my conclusion as to the merits of its rejection, 1st, from having been unable to extract from the high-sounding jargon of pretension of the speeches made in favour of it in the House of Lords, or the arguments in its support in newspapers, enough of any clear or intelligible principle on which it was founded, to show that either its great author, or his subordinates, who must have been its draughtsmen, had themselves any well-defined ideas or any very satisfactory knowledge of what "cheap law" or "cheap justice" was, or indeed what "justice" itself was, as towards both parties to the suits to which the bill, had it passed into law, would have related; and, 2ndly, from remembering, that in the Lord Chancellor's former bill on the same subject, and which bill, to my grievous chagrin and disappointment as a reformer, I did read, the law or justice was not only not cheap law or cheap justice, but it was law and justice to be sold, in direct breach both of the spirit and the express provision of Magna Charta, to the plaintiff in the suit, in the first instance, who was afterwards

to recover the amount, if he could, from the unhappy defendant, in the shape of *FEES OF COURT*, at prices ever before absolutely unheard of. A stock-broker, the nature of whose occupation you so much dislike, buys or sells for his employer 100*l.* "stock," for half-a-crown, or a 100*l.* Exchequer bill for a shilling. And of late years, till the new Uniformity of Process Act superseded this manner of commencing actions, it had come to be thought a hardship that a plaintiff who sued in the King's Bench by special original for a demand exceeding 40*l.* should have to pay to the King, by way of composition for the liberty of suing in his court, a fine at the rate of ten shillings for every 100*l.* of his demand: mark, at the rate of *ten shillings for every one hundred pounds*. But, under the first bill of the Lord Chancellor, the plaintiff suing for a debt of 5*l.* would, before he could have taken out "execution," have had to pay, in successive stages, fees of court amounting together, if I recollect rightly, to somewhere about 3*s.* 8*d.* or 3*s.* 10*d.* in the pound; and which fees were afterwards to have been levied on the defendant; than which, according to all my notions, I can conceive nothing more outrageously or even more senselessly unjust. The late bill having come from the same workshop, I have no reason to suppose it was founded on altogether new and different, or on any very essentially different principles from the former; and, indeed, though I know not from my own perusal what were the particular provisions of the bill in regard to fees of court or otherwise, yet I read, some days since, in the lamentations of a newspaper over its rejection, that there were to have been "*a few small fees*" of court: by which "*small fees*," nevertheless, if I understood the arguments of the newspaper-writer correctly, *all the expenses* of the several courts were to have been paid, so that the passing of the bill and carrying it into execution was, forsooth, to have *brought no burden on the public*.

You, sir, have more than once conceded no stinted share of praise to some of our lawyers of former times. You

have always treated the institution of our superior courts and judges with great respect; and, with one or two natural and very excusable, not to say justifiable exceptions, it has been your general custom to treat our individual judges of late years with all due and proper respect. If, too, you will look round you in the House of Commons, at the very numerous body of *young* lawyers who now have seats in the House, you will find that, with two or three exceptions at the utmost, they are amongst the most liberal in politics of any of the members. Trusting, therefore, that you will not be startled at the name of "*special pleader*," I beg to request the favour of you to insert in your *Register*, as you can make it convenient, some general notions (for the most part struck out at a heat), of an old special pleader, and now a barrister of considerable standing, on the subject of "*law reform*." What I have to submit to you, will relate chiefly to the means of insuring a cheap, expeditious and able administration of justice, whether in local courts for the recovery of small demands and redressing less extensive injuries, or in any other courts. But I propose to add some other notions touching the question of what is "*justice*" as towards both the parties to suits at law; and these will concern the expediency of some modifications of the law itself, as between creditor and debtor. In whatever degree these notions may fall short of, or differ from, any that you or others may entertain on the same subjects, they are the notions of one whose mind has been as severely trained as any man's in the much-misunderstood and much-misrepresented art of pleading, and one who has drawn, in his time, perhaps a larger number of pleadings than, and certainly pleadings quite as good as any that have been drawn by any member of either the first or the second set of "*Common-Law Commissioners*" themselves.

The first essential principle necessary to be fully acknowledged and acted on, in order to the administration of "*cheap justice*," is, that the expenses of all courts of justice, including the

salaries of the judges and all the officers of the courts, and every expense whatever of the courts themselves, shall be borne by the public at large, and not by individuals in their private characters as parties to suits: and as a corollary from this, it follows that the executive government ought to derive no revenue whatever, in any form or shape, from the suitors in the courts as such suitors.

This principle is clearly to be deduced from, if it be not distinctly laid down to its full extent in, *Magna Charta* itself; in which the King at that time (who had his courts for the administration of justice), speaking after the royal fashion, in use from time immemorial, in the first person plural, says, "*we will sell justice to no person.*" But if the King was not to be permitted to sell justice, why were any officers under him to sell it, or of what benefit would it be to the people, that the King himself should abstain from selling it, if it was still to be sold by any person, and to be paid for by individuals having occasion to seek redress, or to defend themselves in the courts? It is evident that the principle I have advanced, would go to do away with all *fees of court* whatever to be paid by the parties to suits. And so extensive would be its operation, that, if it were acted on in the courts at Westminster, the present costs of an action in these courts, exclusive of the costs of witnesses, would at once be reduced perhaps one third.

Under the corollary above drawn, it would also follow that the executive government should derive no revenue from the conveyance by post of letters with their inclosures relating to the business of suits at law; and to this end such letters should be conveyed at a postage not exceeding the average cost of conveyance; suppose, for instance, the postage of a penny on letters not exceeding an ounce, and an additional halfpenny for every additional weight not exceeding half an ounce.

The parties to suits, on whichever of them the burden should in any particular case be thrown, or whether each party should have to pay his own ex-

penses, would thus only have to bear what may be called the natural expenses of a lawsuit, where courts are maintained at the public expense. And these would consist only of their personal expenses, with the fees and expenses of their professional advisers, where professional assistance is resorted to, and with the expenses of their necessary witnesses.

But, besides confining the liability of parties to suits in the matter of costs to those natural costs and expenses of a lawsuit, the number of steps or stages of proceedings, in the course of a cause, should be limited to as few as may be safe and practicable; and in this particular a considerable reform and consequent further reduction of expense might be made. The pleadings, too, should be as concise as the nature of the case will admit of, consistently with clearly apprising the adverse party of the particular cause of action, or ground of defence. I shall not here attempt to enter at all particularly into the subject of pleading, whether general or special. But I may inform the general reader, that the great object of special pleading, where it is permitted or required, is, by confining the parties to specific and particular issues, to ascertain distinctly what are the points in dispute, and thereby, besides protecting either party from being turned round by an unexpected case to be set up by the other, to save, perhaps, a very heavy expense in bringing to the place of trial a number of witnesses whom it might otherwise be necessary to have in readiness. And here I may observe, that if the principle above advanced, were fully established and acted on, and the other matters above suggested carried into effect, the costs of a suit at law to the parties would be reduced to next to nothing as compared with the costs that have ever hitherto fallen upon them, more especially ever since the introduction of the modern system of imposing in most cases on one of the parties, commonly the unsuccessful one, the costs of both. And even with this great reduction of expense, the professional men employed might be as handsomely, or

more handsomely, remunerated for their care and trouble than at present.

Another principle essential to any scheme for an effective law reform is, to take care to insure a *speedy* administration of justice. This principle, as well as the former, is distinctly recognised in, and expressly provided for, though in general terms only, by Magna Charta, where the King says, "We will deny or put off justice to no person." But to insure the speedy administration of justice, and the administration of it to every person, it is necessary that courts for hearing and determining all sorts of causes on grounds of action, should be provided in sufficient numbers, and be placed within the convenient reach of all persons, and their practice be put on such a footing as to insure the trial, without delay, of all causes as fast as they become ready for trial. In so far as a cause is stopped for any unreasonable or unnecessary length of time, while waiting its turn for trial, there is substantially a denial and putting off of justice. This principle also extends to all courts, to superior courts, as well as those of inferior jurisdiction. And at the present moment there is special and pressing occasion for effecting a reform in this respect with regard to the superior courts. For, though by the recent addition of a judge to each of the courts of King's Bench, Common Pleas, and Exchequer, there are now a few more days of sittings at Nisi Prius in London and Middlesex in term time, than there used to be; and though the late Chief Justice, Lord Tenterden, and the two present Chief Justices, and I believe also the Chief Baron, have, with the good intention of disposing of a larger number of causes, and keeping down the number in the list, adopted the practice of taking certain causes, which usually occupy but a short time in trying, out of their turn, namely, actions on bills of exchange and promissory notes, and also other causes which the plaintiff's attorneys choose to give notice of an intention of bringing on as undefended causes (but the strict propriety of which practice, inasmuch as, at least in so far as respects the ac-

tions on bills of exchange and promissory notes, it gives a preference to one description of plaintiffs over others, and those the more sharp ones, who have taken bills or notes, may, notwithstanding, be questionable), yet there are at this moment, that is, at the end of the sittings after Trinity term, in the Court of King's Bench alone, 300 causes remaining untried in London, and, the newspapers say, nearly about the same number in Middlesex. A defended cause in this court in London now waits in the paper for trial, I believe, on an average not less than a twelvemonth. What are the consequences of this? It is impossible to enumerate or imagine a tenth part of them. But plaintiffs are tired out, till many of them are ready or are compelled to compromise with the defendants on any terms. By the next term many of the causes disappear from the list, and are not tried at all. In the mean time many defendants, who may have been able in the first instance to pay their debts, become insolvent. What greater encouragement than such delay can there be to dishonest debtors, or what greater inducement to debtors to become dishonest? What can more clearly be a putting off of justice, what can practically and substantially be more a denial of it?

I should here observe, however, that the above-mentioned arrear of causes in the King's Bench, in all probability, would not and could not have been quite so large, but for an act of Parliament which was passed just three years since. By the act alluded to, the judges of the courts at Westminster were not merely relieved from the necessity of sitting at Nisi Prius in London and Middlesex, beyond a limited number of days after each term; it was not merely left to their discretion how long they might think the state of business required them to sit, but it was actually rendered illegal for them to sit, except with the consent of both parties to the suits, beyond the number of days limited. What was this number of days? Six working days after Easter term, and twenty-four working days after each of the other terms. This was in fact to enact,

that if the business of London and Middlesex required twelve days of sittings after Easter term, and forty-eight days of sittings after each of the other terms (and it does require more), only half of the business should ever be done. A more uncalled-for enactment, an enactment more puzzling to find out what could have been the object in view, according to my apprehension, was never made. I have never been able to get the slightest reason assigned for it by any one, except that it would give to the great leaders at Nisi Prius a long vacation. If the legislature of that day had been minded to show the commonest degree of consideration for the interests of the people in the due and speedy administration of justice, they must and would have enacted something in terms and spirit the very reverse of what they did enact. They must and would have enacted, that one or other of the judges of each of the courts should sit, if necessary, that is, as long as any causes remained for trial, throughout the whole of each vacation. Even this might not have proved sufficient, supposing them only to have provided for the sitting of only one judge of each court at one and the same time. But to render it positively illegal for the judges to try causes in London and Middlesex for more than the short number of days limited, was as if, seeing the insufficiency of the water-way at old London bridge, instead of providing for the building of a new one, it had been enacted that twelve of the nineteen arches should be wholly blocked up in order to force a larger quantity of water through the remaining seven arches, and to cause a diminution in the whole quantity permitted to pass, and that at certain periods of the year, and among these periods from the early part of July to November, the tide and stream should be directed not to flow. The three old courts, however, may, perhaps, without meaning to speak lightly or irreverently of them, in some other respects besides in this of their new position arising out of this recent enactment, be thought to resemble what was old London bridge, as it

existed the other day, with its numerous piers of needless thickness, and the starlings for their support, contracting and blocking up the water-way, and with its five-feet fall at low water swamping the small craft.

It is very evident, then, that even with what the political economists would call the present "effectual demand" for the high-priced law at present dispensed by the three superior courts, those courts, constituted as they now are, are very inadequate to a speedy or effectual administration of all the law and justice needed in London and Middlesex alone. And if the cheap justice, which would follow from the total abolition of fees of court and the other reforms above adverted to, were provided us, the number of actions would so increase, that it might as well be attempted to make the water of the Thames pass through three sugar hogsheads, as to suppose that these courts, with their present number of judges (place them upon whatever footing they might be put for the trial of causes,) could ever get through the number that there would be for trial. And as for country causes, not to speak of the delay in trying causes only twice a year, the assizes would be equally inadequate. By a very large addition to the number of the judges, indeed, and to the places for holding the sittings in, the business might, perhaps, be effectually performed. But on the score of the expense alone, which would be the consequence, it must not be thought of, to attempt to provide the required additional means of administering justice in this way. The more important causes (for the trial of which the three superior courts should be mainly reserved), it may be advanced as a general rule, call for a higher degree of professional learning and talent in properly disposing of them, than actions for smaller demands or less extensive injuries. And it is in the natural order of things, that the remuneration for professional labours, whether bestowed in the capacity of judges, or of counsel, or attorneys, should be on a higher scale in proportion to the higher degree of learning

and talent called for. Actions for small demands and wrongs of minor extent should therefore be tried in courts, the judges and all the officers of which, and also the counsel and attorneys employed in them, should be content with a lower scale of remuneration for their services.

But I have drawn on your columns at such great and, I fear, unreasonable length for a single article, that, if you will have the goodness to permit me to trouble you again, I must reserve for another communication what I have to submit, as well touching the establishing of any additional courts, as concerning any modification of the law itself, as above hinted at, between creditor and debtor.

In the mean time, I remain, Sir, with the highest respect,

Your most obedient
and very humble servant,
J. GEORGE.

Temple, July 31, 1833.

LIST OF THE MAJORITY

Of 215 (Tellers included) who, on the 23. of July, voted against Mr. Tennyson's motion for the repeal of the Septennial Act, and for shortening the duration of Parliaments.

ENGLAND.

Althorp, Viscount	Chaplin, Colonel T.
Anson, Hon. G.	Chetwynd, Capt. W. F.
Ashley, Lord	Childers, J. W.
Astley, Sir J.	Clive, E. B.
Atherley, A.	Clive, Viscount
Baring, F.	Cockerell, Sir C.
Bentinck, Lord G.	Cooper, Hon. A. H.
Berkeley, Hon. C. F.	Crawley, S.
Bernal, R.	Dare, W. H.
Bolling, W.	Darlington, Earl of
Brodie, W. B.	Denison, W. J.
Brougham, W.	Denison, J. E.
Brougham, J.	Dick, Q.
Bruce, Lord E.	Dillwyn, L. W.
Buller, J. W.	Doukin, Sir R. S.
Buller, E.	Duncannon, Viscount
Bulwer, J. C.	Dundas, Hon. Sir R. L.
Burrell, Sir C.	Dundas, Hon. J. C.
Byng, G.	Eastnor, Viscount
Byng, Sir J.	Ebrington, Viscount
Calley, T.	Ellice, Right Hon. E.
Calvert, N.	Estcourt, T. G. B.
Campbell, Sir J.	Evans, W.
Carter, J. B.	Evans, Colonel de Lacy
Cavendish, Hon. Col.	Fancourt, Major
Cayley, Sir G.	Fazakerly, J. N.

Fielden, W.	Ossulston, Lord
Finch, G.	Paget, Frederick
Fitzroy, Lord J.	Palmer, C. F.
Fordwich, Viscount	Palmer, Robert
Forster, C. S.	Palmerston, Viscount
Fox, Lieut. Colonel	Pease, Joseph
Frankland, Sir R.	Peel, Rt. Hon. Sir Robert
Fremantle, Sir T.	Pelham, Hon. C. A. G.
Gaskell, J. W.	Pepys, Charles
Gisborne, T.	Peter, William
Gladstone, W. E.	Phillips, Sir R.
Gordon, R.	Pinney, William
Goring, H. D.	Price, Sir R.
Graham, Sir. J.	Reid, Sir J. R.
Grant, R.	Rickford, William
Greene, T. G.	Ridley, Sir M. W.
Grey, Hon. Colonel	Robarts, A. W.
Grey, Sir G.	Rolfe, R. M.
Grimstone, Viscount	Rooper, J. B.
Grosvenor, Lord R.	Ross, Charles
Hanmer, Colonel H.	Russell, Rt. Hon. Lord J.
Harcourt, G. V.	Russell, Lord C.
Harcourt, Right Hon.	Russell, C.
Sir H.	Sanderson, R.
Harland, W. C.	Sandon, Viscount
Henniker, Lord	Scott, Sir E. D.
Horne, Sir W.	Shepherd, T.
Hotham, Lord	Smith, J. A.
Houldsworth, T.	Smith, R. V.
Howard, Hon. F. G.	Somerset, Lord G.
Howick, Viscount	Stanley, Rt. Hon. E. G. S.
Halcomb, J.	Staunton, Sir G. T. B.
Hope, J. T.	Staveley, T. K.
Hudson, T.	Stewart, J.
Hyett, W. H.	Stewart, P. M.
Inglis, Sir R.	Stormont, Viscount
Jermyn, Earl	Talbot, C. R. M.
Jerningham, Hon. H.	Throckmorton, R. G.
V. S.	Tower, C. T.
Johnstone, Sir J. V.	Townley, R. G.
Kuatchbull, Sir E.	Townshend, Lord C.
Labouchere, H.	Troubridge, Sir E. T.
Langston, J. H.	Verney, Sir H.
Lee, J. L.	Vyvan, Sir R.
Lemon, Sir C.	Wall, C. B.
Lennox, Lord A.	Walsh, Sir J. B.
Lowther, Viscount	Ward, H. G.
Lumley, Viscount	Warre, J. A.
Lygon, Hon. Colonel	Waterpark, Lord
Lyall, G.	Watson, Hon. R.
Maberly, Colonel	Wedgwood, J.
Macaulay, T. B.	Whitbread, W. H.
Maugles, J.	Whitmore, W. W.
Manners, Lord R.	Wilbraham, G.
Mills, J.	Williamson, Sir H.
Molyneux, Lord	Willoughby, Sir H.
Moreton, Hon. A. H.	Wood, G. W.
Morpeth, Viscount	Wood, Col. T.
Mosley, Sir O.	Wood, C.
Mostyn, Hon. E. M. L.	Wynn, Sir W. W.
Newark, Viscount	Wynn, Right Hon. C.
Norreys, Lord	Young, C. F.

SCOTLAND.

Adam, Admiral	Callender, J. H.
Agnew, Sir A.	Dalmeny, Lord
Bruce, C. L. C.	Elliott, Hon. Capt. G.

Grant, Right Hon. C. Ross, H.
 Hallyburton, Hon. D. G. Stewart, R.
 Jeffrey, Rt. Hon. F. Stuart, Captain C.
 Mackenzie, J. A. S. Traill, G.
 Macleod, R. Wemyss, Capt. J.

IRELAND.

Acheson, Viscount Howard, R.
 Browne, D. Le roy, Dr. T.
 Chichester, Lord A. Macnamara, F.
 Christmas, J. N. O'Callaghan, Hon. C.
 Cole, Hon. A. Oxmanstown, Lord
 Coote, Sir C. Perceval, Colonel
 Corry, Hon. H. L. Stawell, Colonel
 Gladstone, T. Verner, Colonel W.
 Gratian, J. White, Luke
 Hill, Lord M.

Paired off against the motion.

Bannerman, A. Johnstone, J. J. H.
 Burdett, Sir F. Kerry, Earl of
 Cavendish, Lord Milton, Lord Viscount
 Cooper, E. J. North, F.
 Cole, Lord Stanley, E.
 Ferguson, Captain Stuart, Lord D.
 Grant, Hon. Colonel Thomson, Rt. Hon. C. P.
 Hoskins, H. Tracy, C. H.

Tellers.

Kennedy, T. F. Rice, Hon. T. S.

LIST OF THE MINORITY

Of 166 (Tellers included) who voted on the 23. July, in favour of Mr. Tennyson's Motion, for the Repeal of the Septennial Act, and for the shortening of the duration of Parliaments.

For the Motion.... 166 } 321 in the
 Against it..... 215 } House.
 Majority against.. —49

ENGLISH.

Aglionby, H. A. Cobbett, Wm.
 Attwood, T. Codrington, Sir E.
 Baillie, J. E. Collier, I.
 Bainbridge, E. T. Cornish, James
 Barnard, E. G. Dashwood, G. H.
 Barnett, C. I. Davenport, John
 Beauclerk, Major Dawson, E.
 Bewes, T. Divett, E.
 Biddulph, R. Dundas, Captain
 Bish, T. Dykes, F. L. B.
 Blamire, W. Ellis, Wynn
 Blunt, Sir C. R. Etwall, M.
 Bouverie, Captain Ewart, Wm.
 Briggs, R. Faithful, George
 Briscoe, J. I. Fellowes, Hon. N.
 Brocklehurst, J. Fellowes, H. G. W.
 Brotherton, Joseph Fenton, Captain
 Buckingham, J. S. Fenton, John
 Bulwer, H. L. Ferguson, Sir R.
 Chichester, J. P. B. Fielden, John
 Clay, Wm. Fryer, R.

Gaskell, Daniel
 Grote, George
 Gully, John
 Hall, Benjamin
 Halse, James
 Handley, Major
 Handley, Henry
 Hardy, John
 Harvey, D. W.
 Hawes, Benjamin
 Hawkins, J. H.
 Hodges, T. L.
 Hughes, Hughes
 Humphery, John
 Hurst, R. H.
 Hutt, Wm.
 Ingham, R.
 Ingilby, Sir W.
 James, William
 Kemp, T. R.
 Kennedy, James
 Key, Sir John
 Lamont, N.
 Langdale, Hon. C.
 Langton, Gore
 Leech, John
 Lefevre, C. S.
 Lennox, Lord W.
 Lester, R. L.
 Lister, C.
 Locke, W.
 Lushington, Dr.
 Majoribanks, S.
 Marshall, John
 Marsland, Thomas
 Martin, John
 Morrison, James
 Ord, W. H.
 Palmer, General
 Parker, Sir H.
 Parrott, Jasper
 Pendarves, E. W.
 Penleaze, T. S.

Phillips, Mark
 Phillipps, C. M.
 Phillips, John
 Potter, Richard
 Pryme, George
 Rider, Thomas
 Rippou, C.
 Robinson, G. R.
 Romilly, John
 Romilly, Edward
 Russell, Lord
 Sandford, E. A.
 Scholefield, J.
 Scrope, Poulet
 Seale, Colonel
 Shawe, R. N.
 Simeon, Sir R. G.
 Stanley, E. J.
 Stanley, Hon. H. T.
 Strickland, George
 Strutt, Edward
 Tauced, H. W.
 Tayleur, William
 Thicknesse, R.
 Tooke, W.
 Torrens, Colonel
 Trelawney, W. L. S.
 Turner, Wm.
 Tynte, C. J. K.
 Vincent, Sir F.
 Vivian, J. H.
 Walker, R.
 Walter, John
 Wason, R.
 Watkins, J. L.
 Whalley, Sir S.
 Wigley, J. N.
 Wilks, John
 Williams, Colonel
 Winnington, H. I.
 Wood, Alderman
 Yelverton, Hon. W. H.

SCOTCH.

Dunlop, Captain
 Ewing, James
 Ferguson, Robert
 Gillon, W. D.
 Johnson, A.
 Majoribanks, C.
 Maxwell, Sir J.
 Murray, J. A.
 Oliphant, L.
 Oswald, R. A.
 Oswald, J.
 Parnell, Rt. Hon. Sir H.
 Pringle, R.
 Sharpe, General
 Stewart, Sir M. S.
 Wallace, Robert

IRISH.

Baldwin, Dr.
 Barrow, W.
 Barry, G. S.
 Bellew, R. M.
 Blake, M.
 Chapman, M. L.
 Dobbin, L.
 Evans, George
 Finn, W. F.
 Fitzgerald, Thomas
 Lynch, A. H.
 Martin, J.
 Mullins, F. W.
 O'Connell, Daniel
 O'Connell, Morgan
 O'Connell, John
 O'Dwyer, A. C.
 Perrin, Sergeant
 Ruthven, E. S.
 Ruthven, E.
 Sheil, E. L.
 Vigors, N. E.
 Wallace, Thomas

Tellers.

Tennyson, Rt. Hon. C. Hume, Joseph

Paired off in favour.

Abercrombie, Rt. Hon. J. Maxwell, J.	Meduen, P.
Buller, Charles	O'Connell, Maurice
Chaytor, Sir W.	Parker, John
Don, O'Connor	Richards, John
Edwards, Colonel	Roche, Wm.
Fitzsimon, C.	Sioclair, George
Godson, R.	Todd, R.
Guest, I. I.	Warburton, H.
Hay, Colonel	

PUFF-OUT.

THE following article, from the *Times*, is curious, at the least. That *this will be done*, there can be no doubt, whenever we shall again have a war with France. This is a mode of warfare which *Pitt began*; and which others will assuredly practise.

From a Private Correspondent of the Times,
27. July, 1833.

An inquiry has recently taken place before one of the Judges d'Instruction of Paris, which has led to some curious discoveries relative to an extensive forgery of Bank of England notes. Some of the money-changers in the Palais Royal had transmitted to London a certain number of 50*l.* notes, supposed to be notes of the Bank of England. They were returned, cut in half, with the word "forged" stamped upon them in the usual way. Search was, of course, immediately made after the utterer of the forged notes, but for some time without success. About 12 days ago, however, a man of respectable appearance went into one of the money-changers' shops, with twenty 50*l.* notes, purporting to be of the Bank of England, for which he required change in gold. The changer happening to be one of those who had suffered most by the late forgeries, immediately sent for the nearest commissary of police, to whom he gave the man in charge on suspicion of uttering forged English notes. The man was examined, and search was made in the lodging, of which he gave the address as being his own, where se-

veral other notes of a similar amount and description were found. The whole of the notes were proved to be forgeries, and the man was put in prison to take his trial for uttering and attempting to utter them. Some days after a person calling himself a viscount, and wearing the cross of the Legion of Honour, waited on the prefect of the police, and said that he had heard of the circumstances of the man's arrest, and had come to bring an additional charge against him. The whole of the notes passed by him, and found on his person and at his lodgings, the viscount said had been stolen from himself. Those, and a very large quantity besides, the viscount said that he had himself forged, and had been keeping by him to use as a means of destroying the credit of the Bank of England at the next war between England and France. The prefect of the police not being so much disposed to keep the secret of the viscount's patriotic intentions as the latter seemed to wish, instantly caused a search to be made at the place of his abode, where, in fact, several bundles of 50*l.* and other notes, purporting to be of the Bank of England, were found, as also every necessary material for making them. The whole of the notes and implements were of course seized, and the other day they were all produced before the Judge d'Instruction, where the viscount was also made to attend in order to answer the inquiries necessary for the drawing up of the *procès verbal*. Some skilful typographers were also present, and they were desired to make experiments with the implements seized. The notes they drew proved such perfect imitations of those of the Bank of England, that in England itself it would have been hardly possible to distinguish them from genuine notes, much less in France. All the parties are bound to appear at the next assizes, but it is probable that the trial of the utterer will be deferred until the January assizes, as the Bank of England, who will probably be the prosecutor, wishes to make every possible inquiry into this extraordinary business, and, if possible, adopt such means as may put

stop to any such "patriotic" forgeries of its notes on the continent. One of the firm of the solicitors to the Bank of England has been sent to Paris for that purpose. Z

BEER BILL

GREAT numbers of petitions have been presented to the House of Commons for a law to put down the beer-houses. The petitioners never, I dare say, gave themselves time to think about the danger of doing this; never to think of the consequences of open and general discontent amongst all those who labour, if not of defiance and resistance! The committee, to whom these fanatical and rigid petitions have been referred, have had the wisdom to refrain from yielding to such thoughtless prayers; and, while they have recommended to the House some slight alterations in the law, have taken care not to suggest any such violent and irritating measure as that which the petitions prayed for. I here insert their moderate and sensible report: and to it I add the curious evidence of PARSON WRIGHT, who was the first witness examined, and whose evidence, when I have concluded it, in the next Register, shall be a subject of remark; and, I will take care to get this parson's evidence sent down into his own neighbourhood. I beg my readers to go through it with attention; I beg them to weigh well all that the parson says about his "PETTY POLICE-SYSTEM," and about his showing a flag to Lord Melbourne! I have no time to remark further upon this subject, or upon any other now; but, when I have got inserted the whole of this REVEREND ROBERT WRIGHT's evidence, I will remark on it, and send it down to be read at ITCHIN ABBAS and the neighbourhood, where this parson says, that he "established a little POLICE at his own expense!"

Other witnesses give a very different account of the matter. They state the great advantages of these beer-houses.

But, the truth is, they *must* continue, till the *small tax* be abolished; a tax, which, in spite of the beer-houses, makes the people pay 13,000,000*l.* while it brings about 5,000,000*l.* or less into the Exchequer! The STAMP taxes are partial, and, in many cases, most oppressive and cruel; but, out of about 7,000,000*l.*, the Exchequer gets 6,800,000*l.*; while, in the case of the malt-tax, it gets little more than one-third of what it costs the people! This abominable tax *must be repealed*; and this is the remedy for all the beer-house evils! They cannot be "put down" by any other means: make every working man's house a beer-house; and, then, all will be well. This one measure will do more to produce general content, and a returning good feeling in the mass of the people towards the Government, than any other twenty measures that the Parliament could adopt.

REPORT.

THE SELECT COMMITTEE appointed to inquire into the STATE and MANAGEMENT of HOUSES in which BEER is sold by RETAIL, under the Act of 1 WILL. IV. c. 64, commonly called BEER SHOPS, with a view of making such alterations in the Law as may lead to their better regulation, and to report their observations, together with their opinion thereupon to the House; and to whom the several petitions on the subject were referred; and who were empowered to report the MINUTES of EVIDENCE taken before them:—Have agreed to the following RESOLUTIONS upon the inquiry submitted to their consideration.

1. That it is the opinion of this committee, from the evidence that has been adduced, that considerable evils have arisen from the present management and conduct of beer houses.

2. That it is the opinion of this committee, that the annual value of the house and premises held by any person

applying for a beer license, be the standard of qualification.

3. That it is the opinion of this committee, that the justices at the first quarter sessions after the passing of the Act, shall draw up schedules for the parishes or townships of the county, showing the rate, varying between seven and fifteen pounds, at which the beer-house licenses shall be granted; subject nevertheless to such alterations within the above limits as the justices may at any future quarter sessions deem right, on requisition of not less than six rate-payers of the parish or township within which the alteration is sought to be made.

4. That it is the opinion of this committee, that it be obligatory, on requisition from any applicant, to give certificate of the amount of rate at which such applicant is rated, and of the proportion which the rate of said parish or township bears to the rack-rent thereof.

5. That it is the opinion of this committee, that it be requisite that any person applying for a beer license shall produce a certificate [signed by six rated inhabitants of the parish (none of whom shall be beer sellers) in which he resides] to the good character of the applicant.

6. That it is the opinion of this committee, that in case of application for the renewal of a beer license, it shall be requisite to produce a certificate (signed by six rated inhabitants of the parish (to the peaceable and respectable manner in which the beer-house has been conducted in the past year.

7. That it is the opinion of this committee, that the certificate be signed by the overseer or assistant overseer, as a proof that the six persons named were rated inhabitants,

8. That it is the opinion of this committee, that it is expedient that some provision should be made, in conformity with the principle of the foregoing resolutions, for granting beer licenses to houses within extra-parochial places not rated to the relief of the poor.

9. That it is the opinion of this committee, that instead of the penalties im-

posed by the act 11 Geo. IV. and 1 Will. IV., the penalty against a beer-house keeper for a first offence shall vary from 40s. to 10l.

10. That it is the opinion of this committee, that in addition to all other penalties and liabilities imposed by the said act, the magistrates in petty sessions shall have the power of suspending licenses upon second conviction, for a period not exceeding two years.

11. That it is the opinion of this committee, that for the third offence the penalty be (instead of a disqualification for two years) a like disqualification for a period, not exceeding three years, in addition to the pecuniary penalties and liabilities imposed by the said act.

12. That it is the opinion of this committee, that the beer-houses be closed on Sunday until half-past twelve o'clock at noon, provided that the keepers of licensed beer-houses may be permitted to sell beer by retail, not to be drunk, on the premises, within the hours now prescribed by law.

13. That it is the opinion of the committee, that lodgers and inmates of licensed beer-houses shall be excepted from the above prohibition.

14. That it is the opinion of this committee, that the period for keeping open at night beer-houses may be beneficially extended in the town, and contracted in country districts; that it should therefore be in the power of the justices of the quarter sessions in open court, once in each year, to fix the periods within their district; in the town districts, not earlier than ten, or later than eleven; in the country districts, not earlier than nine, or later than ten.

15. That your committee cannot conclude their observations on the important subject which was referred to them by the House, without calling their attention to the expediency of the system under which all houses are licensed for the retail of beer and spirituous liquors, being revised in a future session of Parliament; and (without expressing a decisive opinion on this extensive subject) your committee feel that very serious reasons of justice and public advantage may be adduced

in favour of an assimilation of all the regulations as to hours and management to which every description of house licensed to sell beer or spirituous liquors by retail should be subjected.

21. June, 1833.

MINUTES OF EVIDENCE.

THE MARQUIS OF CHANDOS IN THE CHAIR.

The Rev. ROBERT WRIGHT called in, and examined.

Are you a magistrate of the county of Hants?.. I am.

You live at Itchin-Abbas, near Winchester?.. I do.

How long have you resided at Itchin-Abbas, as a magistrate?.. About twenty-six years.

Have you been an acting magistrate?.. I believe that I shall feel the riots to the day of my death; the blow that I got then I shall never recover.

Are you well acquainted with the poor of your neighbourhood?.. I am; from the very first commencements of the riots I have had my eye constantly upon those houses.

In your parish, are there any beer-houses?.. None.

Have any applications been made to your parish for beer-houses?.. There have.

And they have been refused?.. They have, because they were not rated to the poor-rates.

Is your parish an agricultural parish?

.. Altogether so; ever since the riots have commenced, *I have had a kind of petty system of police at my own expense*, which has every week gone regularly round the villages, so that I have had correct information of every thing that has proceeded in those houses.

You have seen, therefore, the effect of those beer-houses upon the population of the district in which you have resided?.. I have.

Will you state to the committee what has been the effect you have witnessed from those beer-houses?.. I think the committee ought to be informed first of the character of the people who keep

those beer-houses; they are generally men who will not work; a little kind of petty tradesmen, who will rather get their bread by any other way than by hard labour; during the riots, those beer-houses were the focus for the meeting of the different parties, and there all the mischief commenced and was carried on by delegates; crime has increased very considerably in our county; I frequently assist as chairman of the Quarter Sessions, and we never used to have more than one or two cases of assault; and within the last three months there have been no less than 38 committals for punishment for offences for assaults, arising from these beer-houses, besides many others who have been fined according to the act; I should state likewise, that the men who suffered the extreme penalty of the law, for setting fire to places in Hampshire, the whole of it came under my own investigation; I sat six weeks every day till I had got sufficient evidence to convict; I had before committed them to prison, but finding the evidence not satisfactory to my own mind, I let them out upon bail, and it was not till a twelvemonth afterwards that I procured sufficient evidence, by my own exertions, *and by a little police I established*, to carry the law into effect; those men I saw continually, and from the time of their committal till the day before their death, they entreated me to use every exertion I had in my power to put a stop to the beer-houses, for they said that those beer-houses brought them to their disgraceful end; I am likewise the chairman of the visiting magistrates, in the absence of Sir Thomas Baring, and I have had a good deal of conversation with the characters committed at the special assize for punishment; I think we had 97, and I do not think out of the 97 there were twenty that did not date their misery to arise from those beer-houses.

How many were sentenced to death that you alluded to just now?.. Four were sentenced to death; one to transportation for life. I think I had 120 witnesses before me.

Were either of those men who were under sentence of death or transportation, keepers of beer-houses?..No, they were not; it is very remarkable, that all the leaders and agitators in that riot were petty tradesmen, such as journey-men blacksmiths, journeymen carpenters; not labourers, but men that really did not want; it arose from the love of mischief with them.

As a magistrate for the county of Hants, are you aware whether any of the rioters assembled in any bodies at those beer-houses?..Constantly; and moreover I can state, from positive information, that the *delegates from the Political Unions* constantly attend those houses, and there they enrol the members.

Was there any case of complaint during those riots, against any regular ale-house, as distinguished from beer-houses?..There were complaints against a variety of beer-houses; 40s. convictions have taken place in every village around me.

During the time you have acted as a magistrate for the county, have you seen any alteration in the habits and morals of the lower classes, since the law passed enabling the beer-houses to be set up?..Not a week passes without having five or six women attending and complaining of the money which their husbands spend in the beer-houses, which is not brought home to their houses.

Is it your opinion that the system of beer-houses has been detrimental to the habits and morals of the lower orders?..Exceedingly so. I think if the legislature does not see fit to do away with that law, it might be put upon another footing, by which you would have more respectable characters keeping these houses; for instance, any person who is rated to the poor-rate, has the power to go immediately to an excise-officer, and demand his license. Now, if no poor man was permitted to have a beer-house, unless he were rated at 15*l.* a year to the poor-rate, I think that would put a stop to a great deal of irregularity that is carried on, because you would have a different kind of character

keeping the house; the men that keep those houses are necessitous men; they are idle men; they will not work, and they will get money in any way that they possibly can.

Have the poor-rates in any parish with which you are acquainted, increased since the system of beer-houses, and to your knowledge, in consequence of the system of beer-houses?..Certainly, because there are a vast number of labourers committed to our prison; when I first was a magistrate, and superintended the Bridewell, we seldom had more than thirty-five people in confinement, and we have seldom less now than 200. I think it makes a difference of eighty or ninety persons constantly in confinement.

Have the poor-rates increased?..They have, for this reason, when the husband has gone to prison, of course the family must come wholly upon the parish for maintenance, and when the money is spent, application is made to the parish-officers, and a great deal of false statement is made, that the husband is not at work or that he only receives so much; but there is hardly a week passes that some complaint is not made for defrauding the overseer by false pretences.

Are you aware of the number of beer-shops in the district in which you act?..There is not a village around me but what has got two or three of those beer-shops.

Are you acquainted with a village called Easton?..I am.

Are you aware of the population of that village?..About 400.

Are you aware of the number of beer-houses in that village?..Three, I think.

Are you aware that in that parish the poor-rates have increased to a great amount since the beer-shops have been established?..They have increased there; and I do not know of a more distressed parish than that is at the present moment.

Have the poor-rates in your own parish increased since 1830?..They have.

How much?..I should think about

10l. a year; they used to be about 120l. and they are now 160l.

In the parish of Easton, do you know what the poor-rates were in 1830 and what they are now?.. No, I do not; but other parishes have spoken to me upon the subject; and Sir Henry Tichborne mentioned to me, that in the parish of Tichborne they have got now to 13s. in the pound.

What were they in 1830?.. I do not know, but some of the farmers tell me they remember when they were only 10l. for the whole parish; they are increasing every year.

Have they increased more in the parish of Easton than in your own parish?.. Certainly.

Do you think it advisable that any alteration should be made in the system of the beer-house?.. I do; and I think the alteration I suggested would be a very good one, because it would put them upon a respectable footing, and whatever advantage the public derive from beer-houses, they might derive without being injured by those characters who absolutely live by what they can squeeze from them.

Have the county rates also increased in the same proportion as the poor-rates?.. They have; since I first acted as a magistrate they have increased from about 9,000l. a year to about 16,000l. a year, and they are progressively going on. Where you have 200 persons confined instead of 35, the county rates must increase. The county rates for the expense of prosecutions at the last assizes alone amounted to 1,286l.

You said that those persons that were convicted, two of whom were sentenced to death and one to transportation, admitted that the origin of their crimes arose at those beer-houses?.. I constantly attended them, and they begged me to warn every person that came before me, that they owed their untimely end to nothing but the company they met with in those beer-houses, and being enticed to do what they did.

Are you aware of the nature of the society in those beer-houses, generally speaking?.. I am.

Do the labourers in the parishes frequent the beer-houses in their own parish, or are they in the habit of going to the next parish?.. Generally to the next parish.

Does that leave the wife and child destitute of the protection of the parent?.. It does very much indeed.

And does it not leave the women open to the visits from the males of the neighbouring parish?.. The women frequently come to me and complain that their husbands' money has gone at those beer-houses.

Do they cook at those beer-houses?.. That I do not know; they sell bread and cheese; I never heard of any thing more.

Have they other amusements at those beer-houses besides drinking?.. I have not met with any instance of card playing.

Have they music and dancing?.. They have a little music, I believe.

And prostitutes?.. I will not take upon me to say that.

Do you think, that if the people who keep those beer-houses were obliged to be in a condition to brew their own beer, or to be compelled to brew their beer, that that of itself would be a great improvement in the state of those houses?.. I do not know that it would, unless you alter the class of people who keep them, because it is of very little consequence to the brewer whether he supplies the house with beer or with malt, because most of those houses now have got into the hands of the brewers.

Do not you think that that of itself would oblige them to be in the hands of more respectable people?.. Not a bit; the only way you could make them respectable is by putting more respectable characters to keep the house.

Must there not be an outlay upon a house that brews its own beer?.. There are very few that do brew their own beer, they generally are supplied by the brewers.

Would it not be an advantage to take it out of the hands of the brewers?.. Yes, I should think it would; many of them would then be obliged to brew

their own beer, which they do not now; and if they were honest characters they would be able to sell cheaper than they do.

What advantage would there be in obliging them to brew their own beer? .. They would brew it better; they would be able to sell it cheaper, and the beverage would be more wholesome.

Would not the having good beer be an additional inducement to labourers that frequent those houses? .. The general character of an Englishman is something like the loadstone and the needle; the beer-house is an attractive thing to him; it is not altogether the beer, but the fellowship they meet with, and the conversation they get into, and the petty publications which are continually carried round to those houses, and which they get to read; I think as long as they can get to those houses mischief will ensue.

Are you still of opinion, that taking the houses out of the hands of the brewers, would be advantageous to the morals and the good police of the country? .. I have seen many instances where a brewer has set up a house, and another brewer has set up a house close by it; a fortnight ago in my neighbourhood an instance of that kind occurred, and a gentleman who lived close by immediately came and complained of it.

In what manner would you propose to take the beer-houses out of the hands of the brewers? .. By increasing the sum that the person should be rated to the poor-rate, and obliging them to brew their own beer; it ought not to be rated at less than 15*l.*, that would be a house sufficiently large to give every accommodation to a man to brew his own beer, but those beer-shops in general seldom have more than two rooms.

Have you not already stated that if you were to prevent the brewers from supplying them with beer, the brewer would continue to supply them with malt? .. I am only speaking of the lower-class of beer-houses; but where you get a respectable character that is rated at 15*l.* a year to the poor-rates, that is a man of some property and he does

not care at all for the brewer, and he can carry on the trade to much greater advantage than a man that has not 6*d.* in the world.

Have you ever inquired whether a brewer cannot supply a publican or any other customer with beer of a better quality at the same price, than the person can brew it himself? .. Decidedly not; I should say from my own experience in brewing my own beer, I get beer half as cheap again, without any nauseous drugs, and more wholesome.

Have you taken into consideration the cost of the utensils for brewing? .. I have.

When you speak of nauseous drugs being used, is it from your own knowledge of such being the case? .. I cannot say that I am in the habit now of analyzing the beer that comes from public-houses, but I have seen it analyzed, and there is certainly something more in it than malt and hops; if they would put nothing but sugar, I think there would be no harm in it, but there is a great deal of *coccus indicus* in it; I know that labourers have complained to me that at some particular houses it almost produces a diarrhoea upon them.

You have stated that by brewing themselves they could obtain the beer at one half the price; why then do they go to the brewer? .. Because the man has no capital; if he had a capital and the house did not belong to the brewer, he would do that.

You have stated that you wished a minimum sum of rate to be fixed for beer-houses, what is that minimum sum? .. Fifteen pounds.

To what part of the country would you apply that? .. To the whole of England; in the neighbourhood of London 20*l.* would be better.

Are you aware that 15*l.* in some parts of England would be almost equal to 50*l.* in London? .. I do not know what it may be in the north; I speak of rural districts.

Can you state the details of the calculations you have made, as to the price of purchasing beer from the brewer and the expense of brewing it at home? ..

I am convinced that a man can brew good wholesome strong ale at 3d. a pot, and the brewer charges 6d.; reckon first the price of a bushel of malt, (malt at this present time is 6s. 6d. a bushel,) it would take three quarters of a pound of hops, 9d.; the grains and the yeast would pay for fuel, and from that bushel of malt you will get 12 or 16 gallons of good beer.

Do you mean of the same quality that is sold at 6d. by the brewer?.. Better, I think.

What do you charge for the utensils and the time?.. I allow nothing for time, because the men who keep those houses do not do any work.

What do you allow for the interest of the price of the utensils and the profit of the stock?.. Half a dozen barrels is as much as any of those houses will want, and a copper and two coolers; 20l. would set up the whole, and less than that, because it is not to the advantage of those people to brew more than two or three barrels at a time.

If there is this vast profit of 100 per cent. between the cost of brewing beer and the price that the brewer charges for it, how is it that the brewer of beer at home does not undersell the man who is supplied by the brewer; and how is it that the practice of brewing at home does not become general?.. If you cast your eyes around this metropolis, you will see beer at various prices; those shops sell according to the strength; but you cannot compare beer brewed at home with brewer's beer; the beer brewed at home is always better to the palate, more wholesome and stronger of malt and hops than the brewer's beer is, but it does not intoxicate so soon.

Do you happen to know what proportion of the public-houses throughout Hampshire are supplied with brewer's beer?.. It is impossible to say; I only know that a great proportion of them are supplied with brewers' beer.

And yet you state that the man who brews at home, if he sells at the same price as the brewer, makes 100 per cent. profit on it?.. Yes, but the brewer can

brew cheaper because he does not brew with malt and hops.

You have stated that the remedy you would propose would be to require that an individual, taking out a license for a beer-shop, should be rated at a certain sum, have you known any instances of persons taking out licenses who were in fact, not rated inhabitants?.. I have heard of it.

Have you heard of any instances in which one person has taken out a license in his own name because he was a rated inhabitant, and another person has carried on the business?.. I have known in the neighbourhood of Portsmouth that one person has taken four or five houses, and sent different persons to those houses; the houses belonging to one individual, but they are kept by servants.

You do not know in whose name those licenses were taken out?.. Not all in the same name.

Have you observed that a different degree of regularity and order is observed in the beer-houses, from the old licensed public-houses?.. The old licensed public-houses are generally kept by people of more respectable character, and in my opinion the old houses are more respectable, and better order is observed in them, because they are more under the immediate eye of the magistrates; if the magistrates find that those old houses do not conduct themselves in a proper manner, they have the power not to grant a license; if there are complaints of irregularity or bad conduct of the people, they are liable to have their licenses stopped.

Have you not the power to fine the keepers of the beer-houses if they misbehave?.. I have the power to fine them under the statute.

Have you known many instances of those fines being levied?.. Hardly a week passes without fines or complaints.

And you think that the principal reason why public-houses keep better order is, that there is some apprehension that they may be deprived of their license by the magistrates?.. That is one reason; but the other reason is that

they are generally kept by people of some little property, and of more respectable character.

Have you known any instances of the keepers of beer-shops, what is called drugging their beer, in order to produce a little intoxication more quickly? No.

Is there not another cause why those beer-houses are under less control and responsibility than the public-houses, namely their situation? It is very difficult to superintend them, they may do almost what they like; I know they are receptacles for game, and a number of things.

Are not those beer-houses situated elsewhere than in villages? Yes, some by road-sides and little back lanes, no matter where.

Are the farmers and more respectable individuals who have occasion to go to a public-house for an hour in the evening, in the habit of going to those beer-houses? I do not think a respectable character ever enters one of them.

Does not that make a difference in the class of persons who frequent them?

Of course the more respectable characters will not sit with a parcel of riotous people.

Who do you mean by respectable persons? I mean the yeomanry.

Have you known instances of the wives of the labourers going night after night, at a late hour, to those beer-houses, to bring their husbands home? I have.

Have you known, that in consequence of the increased number of those houses, when the poor men have been induced to leave one, before they have got home they have been tempted to go into another? I will mention one circumstance in my own village, though I have no beer-shop there; a woman came to me for relief, I said, "What can you want, there is only you and your husband, he earns 10s. a week, and that is sufficient to keep you both;" the man was ill, I went and visited him in my capacity of clergyman, and every thing that that man had was pawned; he had nothing but a bed to lie upon, and a bit of a blanket, and the woman

told me that his round frock, his hat, and his high shoes, and that all her garments, were in the pop-shop for what this man had spent at the beer-shops.

You stated that this took place in your own parish, and that in that parish there are no beer-shops; how near is the nearest beer-shop? About a quarter of a mile.

Did she specifically state that it was at a beer-shop, or at the public-house, that this took place? At the beer-shop.

So that you understood that this man had not pawned his clothes for the purpose of getting liquor from the public-house that was close at hand, but from a beer-house that was a quarter of a mile off? Exactly, because the public-houses dare not harbour characters of that description in my parish.

Was not that man a respectable person? I do not know how a man can be called respectable when he spends all he can get at a beer-shop.

When did he become this drunken person? For the last two years.

Supposing this circumstance had not come to your knowledge, should you not have considered him a respectable workman? *He is the best workman in the parish, as those drunken fellows generally are.*

Should you not consider him a respectable individual? He seldom comes near the church.

Supposing you had not been aware of the circumstance you have related, would you have considered him a respectable individual, or not? Yes, I should have known nothing to the contrary.

That being the case, how could a public-house refuse to receive that individual within its walls to drink a pint of beer? There is a vast difference between giving a man a pint of beer, and letting him sit there and get intoxicated; I said that the public-house would not admit characters of that description to sit and get drunk day after day.

Then this man might have begun drinking at the public-house, and con-

ammated his drunkenness at the beer-shop?.. I do not think he went to the public-house, because it would have come to my knowledge and that of the parish officers.

Had he ever applied to the parish previous to the time you have mentioned?.. I do not know that he had, previously to the last two years; but I have been speaking of since that period; but the man himself did not apply; it is his wife that applied; and I dare say *got a good thrashing* for applying.

How can you feel assured that his drunken habits were produced by the beer-shop, which was so much farther off than the public-house?.. In the first place, he would not have gone to the public-house because his parish officers would have known where his money was gone to, and he knows that when a person becomes chargeable to the parish, there is an Act of Parliament under which persons are liable to be put into prison for a month.

This man being a good workman, earning 10s a week, under those circumstances, how could a publican refuse to furnish him with beer, keeping his house in good order at the same time?.. I am speaking of the last two years since the beer-shops have been established.

What do you know of the man before these two years, do you know that he was not addicted to tippling in public-houses before that time?.. I never heard any complaint of it.

Did his wife ever apply for parish relief before that time, stating that he had pawned his goods?.. Not before that time.

Did she obtain relief?.. Yes.

Is that the manner in which the poor-laws are administered in your parish, that if a husband squanders away his earnings of 10s. a week in tippling, he may still receive parish relief without being put to labour in the workhouse?.. In the first place, we have no labour in the workhouse; and in the next place, is it not an exceedingly hard case that an innocent woman with three children should stay at home and be almost starved for want, whilst her

husband should go about into public-houses and spend his money.

You have stated that the county rates in Hampshire have been progressively increasing, can you state the same of the poor-rates?.. It is like a snow-ball, and if something is not done, it will swallow up every thing; as the population increases the poor-rates will increase; the larger the population the greater your poor-rate must be, *except some better system is adopted.*

You have stated that such a person pawned every thing he had, and finding that to be the case, you found it necessary to supply him with other articles to protect him from the cold during his illness?.. I did; I gave him a double blanket immediately.

You stated that such a character would not have been allowed to frequent one of the regular established ale-houses in your neighbourhood, is it not your opinion that that difference is owing to the better control and management that the magistrates have over the old alehouses?.. It is; and to the other reason that I gave, that the people that keep those public-houses are people of some character and some little property.

What is the sort of control that is exercised by the magistrates over those beer-houses; have there been in your neighbourhood many informations against those beer-houses for misconduct laid before the magistrates?.. There have been a great many.

Then, in point of fact, the parish officers and constables in your neighbourhood do look into the conduct of those houses, and inform of their misconduct?.. They do; and we are very much indebted to the police that have been sworn in in the neighbourhood.

Have there been many convictions under the statute of the parties that keep those houses?.. A great many.

You say there have been informations laid against the beer-shops for irregularities committed in them; have not there been informations against the licensed alehouses?.. I have not had one.

Is there any difference in price between

the alehouse and the beer-house?.. They all sell at different beer-shops; the beer-shops that are supplied by the brewer are exactly the same as what is supplied by the brewers' houses.

Is there not better accommodation at alehouses?.. Yes, there is.

And yet you think the lower classes prefer the beer-houses?.. They do, because they only meet characters of their own description there.

Do you know whether persons in your village are in the habit of frequenting a particular beer-house, when there is a public-house nearer to them?.. I have heard a complaint from the public-house in my own village, that they do not sell near the quantity of beer that they did.

Do you know in your own village of instances of persons living near to the public-house, who pass the public-house to go to a particular beer-shop?.. I do; I see them constantly.

You were understood to state, that they would not be permitted to stay in the public-house to get drunk?.. No, they would not.

Are there not two beer-shops at Itchin-Stoke?.. There are.

And you have a public-house in that village?.. We have, at Itchin-Abbas.

To your knowledge, are those two beer-shops at Itchin-Stoke attended by more of the labouring class than the public-house in that parish?.. They are completely thronged, and more especially upon the Sunday.

Have you ever had complaints against the alehouse in that neighbourhood?.. Never any.

Have there been complaints against those beer-shops in Itchin-Stoke?.. From the families of the persons that spend their money there.

Is it within your knowledge that the two beer-shops within a mile of your village are crowded with labourers while the public-house in your village is not?.. I am confident of it.

Do your own parishioners go from your own village to those two beer-shops within a mile, in preference to the public-house in your own village?.. They do.

You stated that the county rate had increased in consequence of the crime arising from beer-shops; but you afterwards said that the county rate had been going on progressively increasing?.. It has, but it has increased in a greater proportion lately.

Can you state what is the difference since the establishment of beer-houses?.. I should think that the expense of prosecutions has increased more than one-third since the last two years.

Have not the riots occurred during the last two years?.. They were in December 1830.

Did not those arise from other circumstances besides the beer-houses; was there not great distress at the time?.. I think they arose more from people being led away by false views of things, and having placards placed in those houses, which were regularly sent round.

Were they political?.. They were; I gave one to my Lord Melbourne.

Would not the same parties have been admitted into the tap-room of an alehouse?.. No, they would be afraid of being found out, because the characters are more respectable there.

Do you consider it a crime to have a political pamphlet?.. This was not a political pamphlet; it began, "The flags of freedom and liberty are flying over the churches and steeples on the continents; rise, Englishmen, and assert your rights, and pull down priestcraft and oppression. The Reform Bill is only a stepping-stone to our future advantages. Down with the tithes! down with the taxes! down with the places! and down with the pensions!"

Might not such a paper as that have been distributed in the tap-room of an alehouse?.. No; they are carried to those houses for the sake of secrecy and inflaming the minds of persons who are led away, not having discrimination and sense to discern the mischief of them.

You have stated, that music and dancing were not common in those beer-houses, are not those beer-houses under the control of the law the same as the alehouses, with the exception of the power of the magistrates in granting a

license?.. No; I do not think they come under the same act.

Are they not subject to the same punishment at common law for irregularities and breach of the peace?.. If they keep the house open after ten o'clock, they are subject to a fine of 40s., and it rises progressively to 5*l*. after the third conviction, and after that the license may be taken away.

May they not be convicted in the same way as an alehouse-keeper, under the ordinary laws for irregularity and breach of the peace, with the exception of the power which the magistrate has of refusing a license without giving any reason for it?.. Undoubtedly they may; but there is the greatest difficulty in getting people to come forward and give information. The law is good, provided it is carried to its full extent, but you cannot get people to come forward.

You were understood to state, that a great number of informations have been laid, and a great many convictions have followed upon those informations?.. Just around where the police have an eye and authority.

Then your observation does not extend to small parishes where there is no police?.. Here and there it does; for instance, in the parish of Twyford, near Winchester, we have had several convictions, and again in the parish of Cheriton.

Have those informations been successful in inducing the owners of beer-houses to keep better order in their houses?.. Not a bit.

Has any instance occurred in which the penalty of the Act of Parliament has been put into execution so that the person keeping the beer-house has lost his license?.. Not one; they cannot lose their license under three convictions.

Have the first penalties imposed by the act been enforced?.. Very often.

Do you remember any instances where the keepers of public-houses have taken upon themselves to say arbitrarily to individuals, You shall not come here?.. No;

take it that the keeper of a public-house has no right to refuse admittance to a person in that house, but at the

same time, if that public-house keeper permits a person to stay in that house and tittle and get intoxicated, especially a poor man that has a wife and family to maintain, I should say that he is not a proper person to keep that house.

You stated that the public-house keeper would not have allowed those political characters to enter, how could he have prevented them?.. He would have been afraid of losing his license by admitting such characters.

In those cases where the primary penalties imposed by the act have been enforced, have you had any second informations against them?.. In the parish of Cheriton we had an information twice against one house, but the hard swearing has completely carried them through it.

Have you observed any difference with regard to the hours at which the houses have closed, between the beer-houses and the licensed ale-houses?.. In towns the ale-houses are not closed so early as they ought to be, at ten o'clock; but I have passed the beer-houses at eleven, twelve, and one, and I have seen them open.

Have you made the same observation with regard to the licensed public-houses?.. Not to that extent.

Did you convict those beer-houses that you saw open?.. No.

Do you consider that by the statute under which those beer-houses are established, you have any power of convicting a beer-house keeper for keeping his house open after ten o'clock?.. Not upon view.

Have you the power of convicting a beer-house keeper either upon view or through information, under the statute, for keeping his house open after ten o'clock?.. No; you must have evidence that beer was drawn after that hour; the onus probandi rests upon the witness; a man may sit up as long as he likes.

Have you convicted any beer-house keeper for selling beer after ten o'clock at night?.. Yes.

Have you convicted any beer-house keeper, for permitting persons to drink beer in his house after ten o'clock at

night, which beer he had sold before ten o'clock at night?.. That I cannot say; there is room for great evasion.

Have you any power of convicting a beer-house keeper for permitting beer to be drunk upon his premises after ten o'clock?.. Yes.

Have you convicted any persons for that?.. I have.

Can you lay before the committee any list of persons that you have convicted for that?.. Yes; I can send it up to the committee.

Have you ever convicted any public-house keeper for selling beer after ten o'clock?.. Not for these three or four years.

Does that arise from the statute, or does it arise from the public-houses being generally closed at the proper time?.. I conceive from the public-houses being generally closed.

Is not the law more stringent upon a beer-house than upon a public-house?.. Not a bit.

Have you observed whether the keeping of a beer-house is often a beneficial trade to the person carrying it on?.. I think it is, because most of the keepers of beer-shops are little shopkeepers and little petty tradespeople, who are not very fond of work, and they seem to live a great deal better and they dress better than they did.

Have you heard of any of them falling into difficulties, in consequence of the labourers getting into debt with them?.. Yes; I often hear of their not getting paid.

But you think, notwithstanding of that, it is a good trade?.. I think it is.

Have you heard of any of them becoming insolvent?.. Never; there is one man that I convicted, and I was obliged to issue a warrant of distress, but that was the only one.

Since the first passing of the Act of Parliament, has the number of beer-houses increased?.. It is increasing every week.

Do you find that the poor persons in your neighbourhood buy beer at those houses for the purpose of drinking off the premises?.. I do not think they carry a drop of it home.

Are they not in the habit of carrying a portion of it home for supper?.. I think not.

Are those houses in the habit of selling spirits?.. Not to my knowledge; if I knew it I should be bound to take cognizance of it; we have a good deal of smuggling; I have had one or two informations by the excise of their selling spirits.

What has been the result of those informations?.. They have been convicted.

How many instances have you had of that?.. I can only recollect two.

Do any proportion of the population in your neighbourhood receive a part of their allowance from the parish rates?.. They do.

Do you find that persons receiving money from the parish rates, spend their money in the beer-houses?.. Much more than the good labourers; you seldom find a good honest labourer there, except to have half a pint of beer.

Is the spending money in a beer-shop made the ground for refusing the parish allowance?.. When a woman comes and says, I have nothing to eat, and my husband has only produced such a sum of money, it is very hard that the women and children are to starve.

Do you not relieve the man also?.. I have felt it my duty to relieve the wife and children, and have frequently committed the man to prison.

What is the poor-rate in the pound in your parish?.. I should think not 9d. in the pound in my own parish.

Is that the case in the circumjacent parishes?.. No; they are 4s., 5s., 6s., 10s. and even 13s. in the pound.

Are not the poor in a bad state in those parishes?.. They are.

Therefore the moral tone of the peasantry and of the persons who frequent those shops is low?.. Their character is low, and there are a number of idle people.

In the parish of Easton, is it the practice to make an allowance in proportion to the number of the family?.. It is; the parish of Easton is under the Gilbert Act. In the first place, the man before he can receive any relief is bound to go

to the guardian of his parish; he must be refused by the guardian of his parish; he is then obliged to go to the guardian of the united house at Winchester, and he must be refused there before he can obtain any relief at all, and when you get the parish officer before you, and he says to the person applying for the relief, here is a ticket to go into the poor-house, the magistrate's power ends.

Is the Gilbert Act well administered in that parish? Very badly indeed; it was intended as an act of mercy, but it is an act of oppression; a man has got four or five children, he is asked, "How much do you earn?" he says, "I earn 9s.," and he is then told, "You can support your wife and one of the children, and I will take the rest and put them into the united house."

You stated that smuggling exists a good deal in the neighbourhood, has not that the effect of demoralizing the peasantry? A few it has, but I think they drink more beer than spirits, and I think the smuggling gets more into the middle order of society than the lower.

What scale of life are the persons in that possess those beer-houses? They are mere cottagers with generally two rooms.

What do you suppose would be the average value of those houses? About 20s. a year; they are mere cottages.

If, therefore, there was any regulation that there should be no beer-houses licensed under 10l. it would exclude them? It would; but 15l. I think would be much better.

Have you known persons that were not upon the rate-book apply to be rated in order that they might keep beer-shops? Yes.

Would not a rate of 15l. exclude a great number of the regular public-houses? I do not know that.

You have stated that there have been convictions for selling spirits at those beer-houses, is it your opinion that the fear of being informed against for selling spirits prevents their keeping the parties in order? Certainly; it is nothing but that prevents them.

You have stated that there are no beer-houses in your parish; is your parish more clear of crime than the parishes around you? Yes, it is; because in the parish where I live we have not had an illegitimate child born for these 20 years.

Are you cognizant of the state of crime in other parishes as compared with your own parish? I am.

And you are prepared to state that there is less crime in your parish than in the surrounding parishes? Certainly; we lose nothing by depredation in our parish.

In your parish is there a better police than in the surrounding parishes? There is no police but myself.

Are you not an active magistrate, and keep a sharp-look out upon them? I do; I conscientiously perform my duty to the best of my abilities.

Is there any allowance out of the poor-rates in your parish? We do not go exactly into that; every man has so much land, if he has not sufficient to maintain his family he comes to me and I order him relief; we have no settled allowance.

Suppose a man were to come to you and to say, "Sir, I have got a wife and half-a-dozen children, and I have nothing to feed them with," would you give him an increased allowance in consequence of his having six children? Certainly I should; but I have no regular system, because I go according to what I conceive to be the wants of the people; but I can state what the allowance is in the neighbouring parishes, it is a gallon of bread to each person, and if they have four children, sixpence a-head besides.

Do you do anything of that sort in your parish? No.

You stated that crime has increased lately, are you aware of the parliamentary returns upon the subject of the increase of committals since 1817? No, I am not.

You do not know then that there has been a considerable decrease? I do not; there has been an increase in our neighbourhood.

Has there been an increase of com-

mittals under the game laws?.. Yes, there has.

Can you state under what heads the increase of crime has been?.. Petty offences; but generally such as little depredations and assaults arising from the pot-house when they are investigated; they go from thence to poaching and depredations.

Do you find that there are many petty offences of which no cognizance is taken?.. I make up hundreds every year of my life, rather than bring them before the bench.

When you speak of the increase of crime, do you include those cases which are so made up?.. Independent of those there is an increase.

In any of those cases have the crimes been plotted in the beer-houses, or have they arisen from people drinking there, or meeting together there?.. They meet there previous to their setting out upon their errand in many cases, I think in 19 cases out of 20.

Have the poor in general any other place to meet in?.. None.

You said that there were no cases of bastardy in your parish, do you think there has been any increase of that crime in your district?.. Yes, there has.

You said that your parishioners were in the habit of going from your parish to other parishes to drink in the beer-houses, and that nevertheless in your parish there has been no increase of crime?.. Men may walk out upon a Sunday and come home after taking a pot of beer, without getting intoxicated.

Are you in the habit of fining for drunkenness in your parish?.. Never.

Have any of those smaller depredations been committed by drunken persons?.. Yes, by loose, disorderly drunken characters.

Has drunkenness increased in your parish?.. Not in my parish, it has in my neighbourhood; I cannot go out without seeing a vast number of drunken persons.

Has that arisen of late years?.. It has, and it is increasing every week.

What is the population of your parish?.. Two hundred and forty-three.

Do you conceive that spirit-drinking has diminished either in your own parish or in the neighbourhood?.. I do not think that spirit-drinking was ever much thought of in that neighbourhood.

You state that crime has increased in that district, have you formed that opinion by seeing the number of committals?.. Yes.

Do you know whether there has been a better look-out against crime in this district?.. No; I am sorry to say that the *police of the country* is very *badly conducted*.

Are not the expenses of prosecuting sometimes paid for now by the public, and not by the prosecutors?.. There is a portion of the expenses paid by the public, but that is only in cases of felony: but there was 40*l.* upon the conviction of a felon before, and that is done away with.

Did not the Act of Parliament which gave you the power of paying a portion of the expenses of those prosecutions, pass in the year 1827?.. I cannot say.

You state that the persons convicted have implored you to put down the beer-houses?.. *The man that struck Mr. Bingham Baring* two days before he died, begged and entreated me to use *all the influence I possessed to get the beer-houses put down*; and the other men did the same; and of ninety-seven that were in our Bridewell, I do not think there were *five* that did not tell me that they owed their confinement there and their misery to the beer-houses.

Were those ignorant men?.. Some were, but a good many of them were not.

You stated that the leaders of the riots were not agricultural labourers, but the agricultural labourers are the chief persons who frequent the beer-shops?.. Agricultural labourers and the little petty journeymen.

But that the persons who chiefly *coacted* the riots were not persons who frequented the beer-shops?.. I think they were not, but they led those unfortunate people into the commission of the crimes.

You stated that the persons who kept beer-shops were not persons of property, and you stated also that one man was the owner of four beer-shops; was he not a man of property; was he not a person of as much property as some persons that are rated at 15*l*.? I cannot say; I only know that I heard such a house belonged to such a person, and that he put such a person into it to keep it.

Were not the persons that he put in probably persons of less property than himself? They were mere servants; they were mere agents to him.

Do you know the sum required as capital to set up a beer-shop? It depends upon whether you brew your own beer or not; if you do not brew your own beer there is no capital required at all.

In case of an information having been laid against the four different beer-shops that were possessed by one person, would that person who possessed those four beer-shops have had any penalty against him? No; the person whose name is over the door is the person convicted.

Are brewers willing to trust persons of this description with beer? Any body that will open a house.

Are not the persons who keep the beer-houses sellers by commission of the beer for the brewer in most instances? In a great many instances I think it is 16*s*. or 18*s*. the hogshead that is allowed them.

Will you state as far as your knowledge goes, whether the wives and children of the paupers generally speaking, have been worse off and more neglected since the passing of the Beer Act or not? They have.

Have there been in consequence, applications to the parish officers for additional assistance to the wives and families? There have, with every degree of subterfuge to impose upon them.

Is that confined to your own parish? Not to my own parish, but I say it in the investigation of complaints that have come before me.

You have stated that crimes have

been concocted at the beer-shops; in your opinion did any incendiary fires take place previous to the passing of the Beer Act? None.

Have any incendiary fires taken place since the passing of the Beer Act? Yes; all the fires that have happened, have been since the passing of the Beer Act; I suppose 20 or 30 fires in the county.

Have any of the offenders that have been detected been traced upon the night when the fire happened to beer-shops? All of them to beer-shops that very evening.

Would not those parties be able to meet and consult their objects in open fields, if there were no beer-houses? No doubt they could, but they could do it more conveniently in a beer-shop. Of 21 persons that were tried for the murder of the Duke of Wellington's servants, all of them went from a beer-shop that night.

Could not the same crime be concocted in the houses of the individual labourers? No doubt they could.

Have you any reason to believe that such crimes have been concocted in any other places but the beer-houses? I believe not.

Are you aware that convictions had taken place at the assizes for incendiarism, many years before the passing of the Beer Act? Not to my knowledge.

Do not the parish officers visit the alehouses occasionally on Sundays? Yes, they do.

Do they visit the beer-houses? I do not know that they do.

Do you consider that they ought to do so? I consider that it is the duty of the churchwardens to go to the alehouses to see that no one is there during divine service.

You were understood to state that people who frequent the beer-houses, generally left them in a state of intoxication? A great many of them do; they spend all their money, and when that is all gone they are obliged to turn out.

In any evidence that came before you, with respect to the incendiarism, did it ever turn out that the incendiaries

were in a state of intoxication?.. They were generally; at least they were in what they call, according to their own confession, three parts of the seas over.

What class of persons were they?..

One of the persons convicted was an agricultural labourer; another was a bricklayer; another was a bricklayer's labourer.

Are you acquainted personally with the majority of the keepers of beer-houses in the parishes adjacent to your own?.. I am.

Can you state whether they are generally respectable characters?.. I have mentioned that they are idle people; I do not say that they would commit depredations themselves, but they would connive at anybody that did it.

Generally speaking, before the Beer Act came into operation, were they considered respectable people?.. No, they were looked upon as slippery people.

You stated that 20 or 30 fires had taken place in your neighbourhood since the passing of the Beer Act, could the persons who committed those crimes be all traced to the beer-houses?.. Every one of them.

Can you state that in no case were those crimes to be traced to the public-houses?.. I do not think there is a single fire in our neighbourhood or county, that has not originated from the beer-shops, and where they have not started from the beer-shops to commit the crime.

How many cases of incendiarism have been brought to trial in which evidence has been taken on the subject?.. Five or six.

In how many cases out of the twenty or thirty, have you had evidence that the incendiarism was concocted in the beer-houses?.. From the confession of the criminals, after sentence of death passed, I should think that fifty of the persons in the parish where the conflagration took place, and the villages round, were all leagued together.

In how many cases out of those twenty or thirty, had you positive evidence, either before the quarter sessions or assizes, or before you as a magis-

trate, that the incendiarism was concocted in the beer-houses?.. I think that six were tried, and five convicted.

Before the passing of the Beer Act, are you able to state what sort of houses those persons used to frequent before they set out on their schemes of depredation?.. We had no incendiaries; and the other crimes were different from that, and did not require their meeting so much, because it was merely for their sole and self-advantage.

In those cases, when any number of persons went together to commit a crime, are you able to state from what sort of houses they used to go before the beer-houses were set up?.. I should think from private houses.

Has it come within your knowledge, that there have been private houses in your neighbourhood where crimes were concocted, and where beer and spirits have been the constant beverage of those people during the whole of the night? I have heard of it, but I do not know it.

Have you ever met with any criminals who confessed to you that they concocted their crimes at such houses?.. I have never heard them confess that they concocted their crimes at such houses; but I heard them confess that spending their money at public-houses and in sabbath-breaking has brought them to their end.

Was there not a class of private houses where the police had no right to enter, where those persons might drink and concoct their crimes, before the Beer Act passed?.. I never heard but of one, where the man was a smuggler, and sold smuggled liquors.

That was in your immediate neighbourhood?.. Yes, about five miles from me.

Might there not have been such houses in every village without your knowing it?.. I think not; I never knew but of one, and that was a smuggler's house, and he is dead.

And that, of course, was a house in which a policeman had no more right to enter than your own house?.. Certainly.

Have you recently directed your endeavours to trace the criminals to any

particular houses, with a view to ascertain whether the beer-shops are beneficial?.. I have found they all came from the beer-houses.

You said that the beer-houses generally consisted of two rooms only?.. Generally.

If they have not more than two rooms, is it not easy to see whatever drinking is carried on?.. I have heard, but I cannot speak positively, that a man has rented what they call two tenements; one of the tenements is licensed to sell beer, and there is a door which communicates with the other; the beer has been drawn in the licensed house before ten o'clock, and carried through into the other place, and there they sit up to what time they like.

Would not that form a ground for fining a man, or depriving him of his license?.. Not at all.

Are the beer-houses in your neighbourhood well attended?.. A great many people go to drink.

Do not the public-houses in your neighbourhood consist of several rooms? They generally consist of accommodation for a traveller; to give him a bed and a good supper, and any thing he wants; there is generally a parlour or two, and what is called the kitchen and the settle.

Are you aware of certain returns which have been made to the clerks of the magistrates in every district as to the licenses given of those beer-houses?.. No, we had no returns.

Are you not aware that they are obliged to enter into certain securities?

.. Yes, ten pounds each.

Are you not aware that you have a right, as a magistrate, to have these securities produced before you?.. No.

Will you state what remedy you would apply to the evil of the beer-shops?.. The remedy I would propose is, that no man should take out a license for a beer-shop unless he was rated 15*l.* a year to the parish rate; then you would have respectable characters; I think that would answer the purpose better than any thing that could possibly be adopted.

Supposing that should be thought too exclusive, do you think there is any other means by which the same object could be obtained?.. No, I do not; because you have those low cunning characters to deal with, who will evade the law in some way or another.

Are you of opinion that it would not be proper to put those beer-shops under the power of the magistrates?.. I think it would not; the magistrates have already enough to do, and they have power enough already.

Would you propose any alteration with regard to laying informations?.. No; because a man that lays an information is generally marked.

What would be the effect, if you were to prevent the drinking of beer upon the premises,?.. I think it would answer in some measure, but I think not to the full extent.

(To be continued.)

From the LONDON GAZETTE,

FRIDAY, JULY 26, 1833.

BANKRUPTCY SUPERSEDED.

JERVIS, W., Truro, innkeeper.

BANKRUPTS.

FRIEND, C., Munster-street, Regent's-park, milkman.

LEE, H., Down-street, Piccadilly, saddler.

STEWART, J. C., Torrington-square, merchant.

SUDELL, J., T. and W. T. Clough, Darry Lever, Lancashire, manufacturing chemists.

TUESDAY, JULY 30, 1833.

BANKRUPTS.

DENHAM, A., Chorley, Lancashire, tallow-chandler.

EDWARDS, J., Crawford-street, Marylebone, cheesemonger.

HAYWARD, T. B., Liverpool, tailor.

HICKLEY, J., jun., City-road, tailor.

PARSONS, R., York, surgeon-dentist.

STAMPER, R., Torpenhow, Cumberland, drover.

THOMAS, J., Worcester and Evesham, draper.

WINSTANLEY, J. L., Holborn-hill and Cranbourn-street, Leicester-square, hosier.

LONDON MARKETS.

MARK-LANE, CORN-EXCHANGE, July 29.—The supplies of Wheat left over from Friday's market, added to liberal arrivals this morning from Essex, Kent, and Suffolk, caused the stands to be well filled with samples, and the weather proving extremely fine, and highly favourable for all agricultural proceedings, prevented the millers from evincing any disposition to purchase; the market in consequence ruled extremely dull, and sales of all the better descriptions were difficult to effect even at a decline of 4s. to 5s. on the quotations of this day se'night. The depression in inferior descriptions was still greater, and most of the parcels left unsold. For bonded Corn no demand existed.

Barley continuing in short supply, the few samples of grinding offering were held at Monday's rates.

Malt dull, and 1s. per qr. lower.

The extensive supply of Oats the previous week, with fresh importations this morning, rendered the trade excessively heavy, and the article experienced a slow languid sale at a decline of 1s. per qr., as compared with last Monday's currency.

Beans were in fair supply and dull sale, at 1s. per qr. less money.

White Peas sustained no alteration, but Grey and Maple were both 1s. lower.

New Rye hung on hand at from 32s. to 36s.

The Flour trade was dull, and though 55s. may be still quoted by a few millers, yet it was generally understood that the top quotation was only 52s.

Wheat	58s. to 62s.
Rye	30s. to 32s.
Barley	24s. to 26s.
— fine	26s. to 30s.
Peas, White	31s. to 34s.
— Boilers	44s. to 48s.
— Grey	30s. to 35s.
Beans, Small	—s. to —s.
— Tick	30s. to 32s.
Oats, Potato	23s. to 26s.
— Feed	16s. to 21s.
Flour, per sack	50s. to 52s.

PROVISIONS.

Pork, India, new	—s. to 110s.
— Mess, new	—s. to 60s. per barl.
Butter, Belfast	—s. to —s. per cwt.
— Carlow	—s. to —s.
— Cork	72s. to 73s.
— Limerick	72s. to 73s.
— Waterford	70s. to 73s.
— Dublin	—s. to —s.

SMITHFIELD, July 29.

This day's supply of Beasts, Sheep, Lambs, and Calves was, for the time of year, rather numerous; but the two former were, in great

part, of indifferent quality. The supply of Porkers was limited—trade was, with each kind of meat, rather dull—with Beef, at a depression of from 2d. to 4d.; Veal, 4d. to 6d. per stone; with Mutton, Lamb, and Pork at barely Friday's prices.

Full four-fifths of the Beasts appeared to consist of about equal numbers of short-horns, Devons, and Welsh runts, chiefly from Lincolnshire and Leicestershire; but some of them from Northamptonshire, and our western and midland districts; the remaining fifth of about equal numbers of Scots and Norfolk homebreds, Herefords, Irish Beasts, and lusty and Town's-end Cows; about 30 Sussex beasts, a few Staffords, &c.; the Scots, &c. chiefly from Norfolk, with a few from Suffolk and Cambridgeshire; the Herefords, &c. from our midland districts, Sussex, Kent, and the London marshes.

Nearly, or quite, three-fourths of the Sheep were new Leicesters, of the South Down or white-faced crosses, in the proportion of about two of the former to five of the latter; about one-eighth South Downs; and the remaining eighth about equal numbers of polled Norfolks, old Leicesters, Kents, and Kentish half-breds, with a few horned Norfolks and Dorsets, old Lincolns, horned and polled Scotch and Welsh Sheep, &c.

A full moiety of the Lambs were South Downs; about a fourth new Leicesters, chiefly of the Downish cross; and the remaining fourth Dorsets, intermixed with a few Somerset, Kents, &c.

MARK-LANE.—Friday, August 2.

The arrivals this week are large. The market dull, at Monday's prices.

THE FUNDS.

3 per Cent. }	Fri.	Sat.	Mon.	Tues.	Wed.	Thur.
Cons. Ann. }	86½	89½	89½	88½	89	89

COBBETT-LIBRARY.

New Edition.

COBBETT'S Spelling-Book
(Price 2s.)

Containing, besides all the usual matter of such a book, a clear and concise

INTRODUCTION TO ENGLISH GRAMMAR.

This I have written by way of

A Stepping-Stone to my own Grammar;

such a thing having been frequently suggested to me by Teachers as necessary.

1. **ENGLISH GRAMMAR.**—Of this sixty thousand copies have now been sold. This is a duodecimo volume, and the price is 3s. bound in boards.

2. **AN ITALIAN GRAMMAR,** by JAMES PAUL COBBETT.—Being a Plain and Compendious Introduction to the Study of Italian. Price 6s.

3. **TULL'S HORSE-HOEING HUSBANDRY;** or, a Treatise on the Principles of Tillage and Vegetation. With an Introduction, by WM. COBBETT. 8vo. Price 15s.

4. **THE EMIGRANT'S GUIDE.**—Now Published, under this Title, a little Volume, containing Ten Letters, addressed to English Tax-payers. A new edition, with a Postscript, containing an account of the Prices of Houses and Land, recently obtained from America by Mr. Cobbett. Price 2s. 6d. in bds.

5. **THE WOODLANDS;** or, a Treatise on the preparing of the ground for planting; on the planting, on the cultivating, on the pruning, and on the cutting down, of Forest Trees and Underwoods. Price 14s. bound in boards.

7. **YEAR'S RESIDENCE IN AMERICA.**—The Price of this book, in good print and on fine paper, is 5s.

8. **FRENCH GRAMMAR;** or, Plain Instructions for the Learning of French. Price, bound in boards, 5s.

9. **COTTAGE ECONOMY.**—I wrote this Work professedly for the use of the labouring and middling classes of the English nation. I made myself acquainted with the best and simplest modes of making beer and bread, and these I made it as plain as, I believe, words could make it. Also of the keeping of Cows, Pigs, Bees, and Poultry, matters which I understood as well as any body could, and in all their details. It includes my writings also on the Straw Plait. A Duodecimo Volume. Price 2s. 6d.

10. **POOR MAN'S FRIEND.** A new edition. Price 8d.

11. **THE LAW OF TURNPIKES.**—William Cobbett, Jun., Student of Lincoln's Inn. Price 3s. 6d. boards.

12. **ROMAN HISTORY,** French and English, intended, not only as a History for young People to read, but as a Book of Exercises to accompany my French Grammar. 2 Volumes. Price 13s. in boards.

13. **PAPER AGAINST GOLD;** or, the History and Mystery of the National Debt, the Bank of England, the Funds, and all the Trickery of Paper Money. The Price of this book, very nicely printed, is 5s.

14. **MARTENS'S LAW OF NATIONS.**—This is the Book which was the foundation of all the knowledge that I have ever possessed relative to public law. The Price is 17s., and the manner of its execution is I think, such as to make it fit for the Library of any Gentleman.

15. **MR. JAMES PAUL COBBETT'S RIDE OF EIGHT HUNDRED MILES IN FRANCE.** Second Edition. Price 2s. 6d.

16. **LETTERS FROM FRANCE:** containing Observations made in that Country during a Residence of Two Months in the South, and Three Months at Paris. By JOHN M. COBBETT. Price 4s. in boards.

17. **SERMONS.**—There are twelve of these, in one volume, on the following subjects: 1. Hypocrisy and Cruelty; 2. Drunkenness; 3. Bribery; 4. Oppression; 5. Unjust Judges; 6. The Sluggard; 7. The Murderer; 8. The Gamester; 9. Public Robbery; 10. The Unnatural Mother; 11. The Sin of Forbidding Marriage; 12. On the Duties of Parsons, and on the Institution and Object of Tithes. Price 3s. 6d. bound in boards.

A Thirteenth Sermon, entitled "GOOD FRIDAY; or, The Murder of Jesus Christ by the Jews." Price 6d.

Just published, price 6s. a new edition of the

ENGLISH GARDENER,

OR,

A TREATISE

On the Situation, Soil, Enclosing and Laying-Out of Kitchen Gardens; on the Making and Managing of Hot-beds and Green-Houses; and on the Propagation and Cultivation of all sorts of Kitchen-Garden Plants, and of Fruit-Trees whether of the Garden or the Orchard.

AND ALSO,

On the Formation of Shrubberies and Flower-Gardens; and on the Propagation and Cultivation of the several sorts of Shrubs and Flowers;

CONCLUDING WITH

A KALENDAR,

Giving instructions relative to the Sowings, Plantings, Prunings, and other labours, to be performed in the Gardens, in each Month of the Year.

By WILLIAM COBBETT.

Just published, price 12s.

**A GEOGRAPHICAL DICTIONARY
OF ENGLAND AND WALES;**

CONTAINING

The names, in Alphabetical Order, of all the Counties, with their several Subdivisions, into Hundreds, Lathes, Rapes, Wapentakes, Wards, or Divisions; and an Account of the Distribution of the Counties into Circuits, Dioceses, and Parliamentary Divisions.

ALSO,

The names (under that of each County respectively), in Alphabetical Order, of all the Cities, Boroughs, Market Towns, Villages, Hamlets, and Tithings, with the Distance of each from London, or from the nearest Market Town, and with the Population, and other interesting particulars relating to each; besides which there are

MAPS;

First, one of the whole country, showing the local situation of the Counties relatively to each other; and, then, each County is also preceded by a Map, showing, in the same manner, the local situation of the Cities, Boroughs, and Market Towns.

FOUR TABLES

Are added; first, a Statistical Table of all the Counties, and then three Tables, showing the new Divisions and Distributions enacted by the Reform-Law of 4th June, 1832.

COMMENCEMENT OF A NEW VOLUME.

On the 1. of August was Published,

Price Two Shillings,

COBBETT'S MAGAZINE; a Monthly Review of Politics, History, Science, Literature, Arts, &c. &c. Contents of the forthcoming Number:—The Poor Laws—Modern Poetry—Doctrinaire Government and the Factory System—The Lakes and the Lake Poets—Patriotism—Recollections of an Old Hat—The London Bridges—The House Tax—The Water Drinker—Rossi's Sculptures—Molly Gray—Funeral in the Country—Events of the Month—Critical Notices, &c.

11, Bolt-court, Fleet-street, and EFFINGHAM WILSON, Royal Exchange; and may be had of all respectable booksellers in Town and Country, without any additional charge.

**JOURNAL
OF**

**A TOUR IN ITALY,
AND ALSO IN PART OF
FRANCE AND SWITZERLAND;**

The route being

From Paris, through Lyons, to Marseille, and, thence, to Nice, Genoa, Pisa, Florence, Rome, Naples, and Mount Vesuvius;

AND

By Rome, Terni, Perugia, Arezzo, Florence, Bologna, Ferrara, Padua, Venice, Verona, Milan, over the Alps by Mount St. Bernard, Geneva, and the Jura, back to France;

The space of time being,
From October 1828, to September 1830.

CONTAINING

A description of the country, of the principal cities and their most striking curiosities of the climate, soil, agriculture, horticulture, and products; of the prices of provisions and labour; and of the dress and conditions of the people;

AND ALSO

An account of the laws and customs, civil and religious, and of the morals and demeanour of the inhabitants, in the several States.

By JAMES P. COBBETT.

HOME-MADE WINE. — The peculiar adaptation of BETT'S PATENT FRENCH-DISTILLED BRANDY to the improvement of British Wines, has long induced Connoisseurs to adopt it in preference to any other Spirit. The harshness incident to all home-made Wines, and which hitherto alone could correct, is entirely avoided, and a maturity and mellowness imparted to the Wines which the PATENT BRANDY is exclusively capable of producing.

J. T. BETTS and Co. deem it expedient to state, that their only Establishment is at No. 7, Smithfield Bars (leading to St. John-street), where the PATENT BRANDY, either pure or COLOURED, may be had, in quantities not less than two gallons, at Eighteen Shillings per Imperial Gallon, for cash on delivery. N.B. A liberal allowance to the Trade.

Printed by William Cobbett, Johnson's-court; and published by him, at 11, Bolt-court, Fleet-street.